

2009 Update to the EOC Funding Model

Authority

The Education Oversight Committee (EOC) bears statutory responsibility to, among other tasks,

- (2) make programmatic and funding recommendations to the General Assembly;
- (3) report annually to the General Assembly, State Board of Education, and the public on the progress of the programs;
- (4) recommend Education Accountability Act and EIA program changes to state agencies and other entities as it considers necessary. (SC Code of Laws 1976, as amended, §59-6-10).

The statutes further require the EOC's Division of Accountability to

- (3) monitor and evaluate the functioning of the public education system and its components, programs, policies, and practices and report annually its findings and recommendations in a report to the commission no later than February first of each year (SC Code of Laws 1976, as amended, §59-6-110).

Background

In December of 2003 the EOC requested that the staff propose a revised funding model for public education. The model was developed to respond to five questions:

1. What is the educational program mandated in statute or regulation?
2. What is the cost of the educational program in an average school district or school?
3. Are there ways to spend public dollars to foster higher achievement?
4. What dollars in the public domain are dedicated to schools and districts?
5. What is the state-district balance in educational spending?

The original model established a new base student cost and had the following assumptions:

- All services to children in public schools as required by state law and regulation would be provided, and the costs reflected in the base student cost.
- The average teacher salary in South Carolina would be \$300 above the Southeastern average teacher salary. The salaries for all other professional and administrative staff were based upon the mean of the average salaries of personnel employed in the Southeast region as determined by the Educational Research Service.
- The model would be based on district and school enrollment accordingly: district enrollment of 7,500 students; elementary school enrollment of 500; middle school enrollment of 750 and high school enrollment of 900. Table 1 below provides a comparison of the enrollments in the model with the actual school and district enrollments based on the 2008 school and district report cards.

Table 1
Enrollment Comparisons

	Model	2008 Mean	2008 Median
District (n=85)	7,500	8,348	4,701
Elementary School (n=631)	500	528	511
Middle School (n=296)	750	575	536
High School (n=211)	900	987	892

* There are an additional 34 primary schools not reflected in these numbers

- The pupil teacher ratio in **all** grades would be maintained at 21:1 with additional teachers needed for smaller class sizes for special needs children. The additional cost for providing smaller class sizes for special education would be paid for with existing special education weights.
- Additional weights for students in poverty and students needing remediation would be calculated and included at a later time in the model.

In 2006 the EOC modified the model to include three categories of weights:

1. *General educational weights* were assigned for each student which is essentially the base student cost for “average” students in grades K through 12 with weights that exceed 1.0 for students with disabilities and students in vocational education. To date, the EOC has not recommended amending the weight for students with disabilities because the data are not available. The weight for students on homebound instruction was changed to 1.0. Each student enrolled in public schools would receive one of these general educational weights.
2. *Compensatory weights* address the contexts or factors that detract from high achievement over time. These weights are in addition to the general educational program weights. A compensatory weight of 0.20 is included for children in poverty. Poverty is defined as children eligible for the free or reduced-price federal lunch program and/or eligible for Medicaid. A weight of 0.20 is included for students with limited English proficiency who require intensive English language instruction programs and whose families require specialized parental involvement intervention. (In the Fiscal Year 2009-10 General Appropriations Act six EIA line item appropriations were consolidated into one line item, Students at Risk of School Failure. Funds in the new line item appropriation of \$136 million are allocated to school districts based on two factors: (1) the poverty index of the district; and (2) the number of students not in poverty or eligible for Medicaid but who fail to meet state standards on state standards-based assessments in either reading or mathematics.
3. *Program weights* fund programs designed to address individual student academic or artistic needs. A weight of 0.15 is included for students who do not meet state standards on mathematics, English language arts or both to guarantee that the students receive additional tutoring, additional hours of instruction in summer school, extended school year, etc. Students who are classified as gifted and talented either academically or artistically would receive

funds for services provided included IB and AP courses in the high school with a weight of 0.15. And, young adults aged 17 to 21 who are pursuing a diploma or GED through adult education or other means but are no longer part of the regular school setting would be funded at a weight of 0.20. The model would recommend that adult education for individuals over age 21 would be provided through the technical college system and not through public schools.

Table 2 documents the current EFA weights and proposed weights of the model.

Table 2
Weights of the EOC Funding Model

Classifications	Current EFA Weights	Model Weights
K-5	Kindergarten, 1.30 Primary (1-3), 1.24	1.0
Grades 6-8	Elementary (4-8) 1.00	1.0
Grades 9-12	1.25	1.0
Disabilities:		
Educable Mentally Handicapped	1.74	1.74
Trainable Mentally Handicapped	2.04	2.04
Emotionally Handicapped	2.04	2.04
Visually Handicapped	2.57	2.57
Hearing Handicapped	2.57	2.57
Orthopedically Handicapped	2.04	
Speech	1.90	1.90
Autism	2.57	2.57
Homebound	2.10	1.0
Vocational:		1.2
V1	1.29	
V2	1.29	
V3	1.29	
OTHER:		
Poverty (K-12)		.20
Non-English Speaking		.20
Gifted and Talented (Grades 3-12)		.15
Remediation		.15
Adult Education 17 to 21 year-olds		.20

In 2008 the model was further amended. Costs related to formative assessments as required by Act 282 of 2008 were included in the base student costs as well as funding for High Schools that Work. The 2008 model also proposed that the General Assembly consider making one step towards implementation of the EOC funding model in Fiscal Year 2009-10. The EOC recommended that the General Assembly consider the consolidation of fourteen EIA line items into four and the elimination of twenty corresponding provisos. While the EOC had recommended that school districts be held harmless by guaranteeing that no district would receive fewer funds in Fiscal Year 2009-10 than it received in Fiscal Year 2008-09, EIA revenue

reductions resulted in appropriation cuts of 16% to most EIA-funded programs, making it possible to consolidate the funds without a hold harmless provision.

The General Assembly in the 2009-10 General Appropriations concurred with the EOC recommendation and consolidated EIA line items accordingly:

- Appropriations to school districts for Gifted and Talented, Advanced Placement and Junior Scholars were consolidated into one line item, "High Achieving Students." The funds appropriated for High Achieving Students are now allocated back to school districts based on two factors: "(1) the number of students served in academic gifted and talented programs based on the prior year's 135-day count of average daily membership adjusted for the current year's 45-day count and the number of students identified as artistically gifted and talented; and (2) the number of students taking Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate (IB) exams in the prior year." (Proviso 1A.61.)
- Appropriations to school districts for Act 135 Academic Assistance Programs, Alternative Schools, Summer Schools, Reduce Class Size, Parent Support and Family Literacy were combined into one line item, "Students at Risk of School Failure." By proviso the funds are allocated to school districts based on (1) the poverty index of the district as documented on the most recent district report card, which measures student eligibility for the free or reduced price lunch program and Medicaid; and (2) the number of students not in poverty or eligible for Medicaid but who fail to meet stand standards on stat standards-based assessments in either reading or mathematics." (Proviso 1A.62.)
- Appropriations to the South Carolina Department of Education for the Governor's Reading Initiative, Reading Recovery, and one-fourth of existing professional development funds were reallocated to one line item, "Reading." According to proviso 1A.60., at least twenty-five percent of these funds must be allocated directly to school districts base don the number of weighted pupil units in each school district. The remaining funds are retained by the Department to "implement a comprehensive plant o improve reading, inducing the use of Reading Recovery and other reading initiatives and to increase the number of students scoring at met and exemplary levels on state assessments."
- Appropriations to Critical Teaching Needs, Math and Science Hubs, NSF Grants, and three-fourths of existing professional development funds were consolidated into one line item, "Professional Development." These funds must be allocated to districts based on the number of weighted pupil units in each school district in proportion to the statewide weighted pupil units using the 135 day count of the prior school year. . . . No more than twenty-five percent of the funds appropriated for professional development may be retained by the Department of Education for the administration and provision of professional development services." (Proviso 1A.63.)

The consolidation of these line items and related provisos accomplished the following:

1. Assigned school districts greater financial and programmatic flexibility to expend the funds for educational services that best meet the needs of individual students;

2. Allocated the funds based on individual student classifications like poverty or the number of students in the district; and
3. Targeted resources to improving reading and literacy in the state.

2009 Updates

Each year the EOC has updated the base student cost to reflect changes in salaries and state law and has projected weighted pupil unit counts to reflect changes in student enrollment across weights. The 2009 model is based upon a projected Southeastern average teacher salary of \$48,172 for Fiscal Year 2008-09.¹ In prior years the base student cost had been predicated on an average teacher salary of \$300 above the projected southeastern average teacher salary. Due to the impact of the national recession on state revenues, the General Assembly in the 2009-10 General Appropriations Act did not increase average teacher salaries and instead maintained the statewide minimum teacher salary that was used in FY2008-09 in FY2009-10. Proviso 1A.17. of the 2009-10 General Appropriations Act did reiterate that “the General Assembly remains desirous of raising the average teacher salary in South Carolina through incremental increases over the next few years so as to make such equivalent to the national average teacher salary.”

Using the projected southeastern average teacher salary of \$48,172, the base student cost of the EOC funding model in 2009 is \$6,008. (Table 3). There were no other changes in permanent law or regulation that had a monetary impact on the EOC funding model.

Table 3
Base Student Cost of EOC Funding Model over Time

Year	Base Student Cost	Projected Teacher Salary	Total Weighted Pupil Units²
2003	\$5,239	\$40,959	825,971
2004	\$5,347	\$42,737	839,493
2005	\$5,657	\$43,991	836,837
2006	\$5,311	\$43,991	905,923
2007	\$5,606	\$45,479	911,020
2008	\$5,800	\$47,304	914,483
2009	\$6,008	\$48,172	919,651

The average teacher salary used in the model increased by 1.8% while the total base student cost increased by 3.6% from \$5,800 in 2008 to \$6,008 in 2009. In comparison, the Office of Research and Statistics projected the EFA inflation factor for FY2009-10 to be 4.22% and for FY2010-11, 1.23%. In comparing the details of the cost calculations contained in the appendix, the portion of the base student cost attributable to costs incurred at the district level increased by 10% from 2008 to 2009. The mean per pupil expenditure for safety, building upkeep and maintenance, data processing and business operations increased from \$1,016 per pupil in FY08 to \$1,166 in FY09 as reported on In\$ite data. The other components of the base student cost (high, middle and elementary school instruction) increased only minimally as a result of the increase in the teacher salaries as shown in Table 4.

¹ Letters from William C. Gillespie to John K. Cooley of the South Carolina Department of Education, August 25, 2009 and August 12, 2008.

² Rounded to the nearest whole number.

Table 4
Base Student Cost Calculations, Cost Per Pupil

	2009	2008
District	\$1,929.63	\$1,753.54
High School	\$4,079.29	\$4,016.45
Middle School	\$4,009.05	\$3,956.22
Elementary School	\$4,073.17	\$4,047.36
Base Student Cost:		
Minimum	\$5,938.68	\$5,709.76
Average	\$5,983.47	\$5,760.22
Maximum	\$6,008.92	\$5,800.90

Table 5 documents the projected number of weighted pupil units or WPU's. These WPU's are based upon the model weights listed in Table 1. The projected number of students needing remediation is updated to reflect the 2008 administration of PACT. Historically, the number of WPU's related to remediation have been based on the prior year's PACT scores. With anticipated release of PASS scores in June of each year, the remediation WPU's will be based on current year's projections. The number of weighted pupil units increased 0.6% from 914,483 in 2008 to 919,651 in 2009. For comparison purposes, total student enrollment in public schools increased by 0.7% from 2006-07 to 2007-08, from 704,590 to 709,564.³

Table 5
Weighted Pupil Units by Classifications

Classifications	Weights	WPU's⁴ (FY2010)
K-5	1.0	279,110
6-8	1.0	137,076
9-12	1.0	77,033
Disabilities	Vary by disability and are same as those used in EFA	170,271
Homebound	1.0	2,278
Vocational	1.2	125,139
TOTAL General Education WPU's		790,907
Poverty (K-12)	.20	88,177
Non-English Speaking	.20	5,600
TOTAL Compensatory WPU's		93,777
Gifted and talented (3-12)	.15	15,325
Remediation	.15	15,890
Adult Education 17 to 21 year-olds	.20	3,752
TOTAL Program WPU's		34,967
ALL WPU's		919,651

³ South Carolina Department of Education. 2007 and 2008 District Fact Files.
<http://ed.sc.gov/agency/Accountability/Data-Management-and-Analysis/SchoolReportCardsByYear.html>.

⁴ Rounded to nearest whole number.

Based upon the revised base student cost and weighted pupil units, the total cost to fund the EOC model in 2009 is \$5.6 billion as shown in Table 6. The cost is determined by multiplying the base student cost of \$6,008 by the total number of weighted pupil units, 919,651.

Table 6
Cost of Weights at Base Student Cost of \$6,008

General Education Weights	790,907	\$4,751,769,256
Compensatory Weights	93,777	\$563,412,216
Program Weights	34,967	\$210,081,736
TOTAL	919,651	\$5,525,263,208

For comparison purposes, in Fiscal Year 2007-08 school districts received revenues from the following sources as illustrated in Table 7⁵. Excluded are intergovernmental revenues totaling \$34,521,764 and “other revenues” including general obligation bonds of \$1,192,857,264.⁶ The state revenues include general fund, EIA and lottery appropriations as well as EAA technical assistance funds. Using FY08 district revenues, the combined revenues from state and local sources alone total \$6.9 billion which exceeds the total cost of the EOC model by approximately \$1.4 billion. *It should be noted that local funds provide programs and initiatives that are not addressed by the EOC funding model and are implemented at the discretion of local school districts. Furthermore, state budget reductions in Fiscal Year 2008-09 and in the first half of Fiscal Year 2009-10 reduced the amount of state revenues available for public education.*

Table 7
District Revenues

Source	Fiscal Year 2007-08⁷
State	\$3,786,664,032
Local	\$3,087,430,111
Federal	\$714,553,010
TOTAL	\$7,588,647,153

New Information

In updating the base student cost and model, the EOC staff routinely researches school finance issues as well as developments in school finance in other states. The following information represents recent research on funding for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students and on school finance in North Carolina.

Funding Services for Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students

The Maine Education Policy Research Center at the University of Southern Maine issued in January 2009 a report to the Maine Joint Standing Committee on Education and Cultural Affairs.

⁵ South Carolina Department of Education, Office of Finance. <http://www.ed.sc.gov/agency/Finance-and-Operations/Finance/old/finance/documents/distrev08.xls>.

⁶ Email from Mellanie Jinnettee to South Carolina Department of Education.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ The report reviewed funding strategies used by other states to support LEP students and provided analysis of LEP enrollment and expenditures in Maine. The report documents that “all but six states have established Limited English Proficiency state funding policy. The remaining 44 states have established methods of LEP funding allocation based on one of three models, pupil weighting, flat grants, and resources based.” ⁹

LEP State Funding Policy	Number of States (%)	Range
Pupil Weighting	22 (44%)	0.096-1.53
Flat Grant	12 (24%)	\$20 - \$1,000
Resource Based/Other	9 (18%)	Varies
None	6 (12%)	0

* LEP state funding information could not be found for Arizona.

Regarding states in the Southeast, the report documents the following funding policies for LEP students:¹⁰

State	Funding Program	Allocation/Weight
Alabama	Flat Grant	\$279 per ELL student
Arkansas	Flat Grant	\$293 per ELL student
Florida	Weighting	0.20
Georgia	Weighting	1.5306 (in addition to 1.0 base student cost)
Louisiana	Weighting	0.21
Mississippi	None	
North Carolina	Resourced Based Formula	Base of a teacher assistant plus remainder based on 50% number of funded ELL and 50% on LEA concentration of ELL
South Carolina	None	
Tennessee	Resource Based	70% of 1 instructor salary per 30 students and 70% of salary of 1 ELL translator per 300 students
Virginia	Resource	17 teachers per 1,000 students X Average salary and fringe benefits
West Virginia	None	

School Finance Report in North Carolina

In November 2007 the North Carolina Joint Select Committee on Public School Funding Formulas was created by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the

⁸ Silvernail, David L. and Ida A. Batista. “Further Review of the Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Adjustment in the Essential Programs and Services Funding Formula,” Maine Education Policy Research Center, January 2009, http://www2.umaine.edu/mepri/sites/default/files/EPS_LEPComponent%20Review2008-09_Final.pdf.

⁹ Ibid, p. 2.

¹⁰ Ibid, Appendix A, Table A.

House of Representatives. The Committee issued an interim report in 2008 that recommended “an independent study of all major State public school funding formulas. The study should evaluate the efficiency, equity, and efficacy of State public school investments.”¹¹ Furthermore, “the Contractor will evaluate North Carolina’s funding structure to determine whether it clearly allocates fund among LEAs in a manner that:

- Targets student achievement;
- Encourages efficient use of resources;
- Ensures that all children, regardless of race, gender, ethnicity, disability, socioeconomic status and geography, are provided the opportunity to receive a sound basic education; and
- Minimizes complexity so that funding is provided in a transparent, understandable manner.”¹²

On July 20, 2009 the Committee postponed awarding a contract and to date, no additional action has occurred.

Implementation Issues

How can the EOC model be further implemented when the state of South Carolina is experiencing significant declines in revenues? For Fiscal Year 2010-11 the EOC has recommended that additional line item appropriations be consolidated. All adult education and young adult education general fund and EIA revenues would be consolidated and funded with EIA revenues. A minimum of one-third of the consolidated funds for adult education would be targeted for young adult education. In addition, three EIA programs (Middle School Initiative, Principal Salary Supplement and Credits for High School Diploma) would be consolidated and funded through the Education Finance Act. These line items are appropriated for the salaries of safety resource officers, nurses, principals and teachers. Also four EIA line item appropriations that address business and family engagement would be consolidated into one line item. The new line item would create a competitive grant to school districts that seek to engage family engagement in promoting student academic achievement.

Summary of Updates to EOC Funding Model in 2009

1. The base student cost increased from \$5,800 in 2008 to \$6,008 in 2009, a 3.6% increase compared to a 3.5% increase last year. The portion of the base student cost attributable to costs incurred at the district level increased by 10% from 2008 to 2009. The mean per pupil expenditure for safety, building upkeep and maintenance, data processing and business operations increased from \$1,016 per pupil in FY08 to \$1,166 in FY09 as reported on In\$ite data. Additional analysis of and explanations for the increase are warranted.

2. The total weighted pupil units for the EOC model increased by 0.6% from 914,483 in 2008 to 919,651 in 2009. Similarly, student enrollment between school years 2006-07 and 2007-08 increased by 0.7% from 704,590 to 709,564.

3. The total cost of the EOC funding model in 2009 is \$5.5 billion. For comparison purposes, school districts had state and local revenues totaling \$6.9 billion in Fiscal Year 2007-08.

¹¹ Request for Proposals, “Study of Public School Funding Formulas and Distributions,” North Carolina General Assembly, Joint Legislative Study Committee on Public School Funding Formulas, May 5, 2009, <[http://www.ncleg.net/documentsites/committees/JLSCPSFF/PSFF%20Study%20RFP/PSFF_RFP_2009_06_05_\(with_appendices\).pdf](http://www.ncleg.net/documentsites/committees/JLSCPSFF/PSFF%20Study%20RFP/PSFF_RFP_2009_06_05_(with_appendices).pdf)>.

¹² Ibid, page 4.

4. Implementation of the model began in the 2009-10 General Appropriations Act and can be continued in the 2010-11 through additional consolidation of line item appropriations including line items for adult education and parent and community engagement.

5. There are other issues related to the implementation of the model that must be addressed. Should the state continue to pay 70% of the total cost of the model and districts 30% as currently required by the Education Finance Act? Or should the percentages change? What funds should be attributed to or allocated to the funding model?

APPENDIX to the 2009 EOC Funding Model

PER PUPIL EXPENDITURES IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Across School/District Enrollment

An Analysis of State Requirements of Schools and Districts

Costs Reflect Requirements of Statute, Regulation and Fiscal Year 2009-10 General Appropriations Act

GENERAL ASSUMPTIONS:

1. This model is built upon the following assumed enrollments: Elementary (K-5) = 500; Middle (6-8) = 750; High (9-12) = 900; and District enrollment of 7,500. According to the 2008 district and school report cards, for those schools receiving a report card, the mean enrollment for districts and schools is as follows: District = 8,348; Elementary = 529; Middle = 573; and High = 983.
2. Based on 2008 school and district report cards, 65.06% of students in school year 2007-08 were eligible for free/reduced price lunch program and/or eligible for Medicaid.
3. The most recent available data are used for cost projections and include: FY08 In\$ite data; 2008 school and district report cards; and the *2008-09 Funding Manual* published by the South Carolina Department of Education.
4. Estimates of teachers needed are rounded to the next highest half of a teacher.
5. Salaries for classroom teachers and physical education teachers are based on Fiscal Year 2009-10 projected Southeastern average teacher salary of \$48,172.
6. Unless noted, salaries for support staff are based on Table 15 of *Salaries and Wages Paid Professional and Support Personnel in Public Schools, 2008-09* published by Educational Research Service. These salaries are the mean of the average salaries of personnel employed in the Southeast region which includes AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, and WV.
7. All fringe benefits are calculated at 28% of the salary of all personnel.
8. Cost of five additional day for classroom teachers determined by calculating the cost of one day of salary, \$48,172, divided by 190; then adding 28% for fringe benefits, the cost per day for is \$325. The cost of the additional five days is \$1,625 per teacher.
9. The statewide base student cost is rounded to the nearest whole dollar. The total state weighted pupil unit count projects are rounded to the nearest whole number.

SCHOOLS GENERALLY

According to Proviso 1.3 the base student cost for FY2009-10 is \$2,334 of which \$300 is paid for with State Stabilization funds pursuant to Title XVI of the federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. The actual base student cost as projected by the Office of Research and Statistics for FY 2009-10 was \$2,687.

Provisos 1.5 and 1.6 pertain to the funding of employer contributions

59-1-425 establishes the school term of 180 days of instruction with the instructional day at a minimum of six hours a day, excluding lunch. The law stipulates ten days of inservice training of which three days must be used for "collegial professional development," up to two days to prepare for the opening of school and the remaining five days for teacher planning, academic plans, and parent conferences. Data for classroom teachers are used in school level calculations which follow; salary funding is through EFA and EIA salary supplements for teachers. Based on FY08 In\$ite data, per pupil expenditures for professional development were \$343 in the state.

DISTRICT Enrollment of: 7,500

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED *	Variable*	COST PER DISTRICT	COST PER PUPIL
59-17-135 Each district must have a character education policy	No additional cost				
59-19-20 Each district must have a board composed of at least three members	Average compensation per board member is \$123.24 per meeting. With three board members and twelve meetings per year, the total cost is \$4,436.64 /year.			\$4,436.64	\$0.59
59-19-45 Each new school district member must participate in orientation	Statewide the cost of training is \$151,570 or \$1,783 per district.			\$1,783.00	\$0.24
59-20-60/R43-261 Each district and school must develop a school renewal/improvement plan and operate a School Improvement Council	No additional cost				
59-24-30 Each administrator must complete an individual professional development plan	No additional cost				
59-13-60/R43-209 Each school district must employ a chief administrative officer and secretary. Superintendent also has requirements under EAA, EEDA, student expulsion laws, Parental Involvement in Their Children's Education Act, etc.	1.0 Superintendent Note: The mean average is for contract salary. Many superintendents receive additional compensation such as an annuity payment.	\$160,719		\$205,720.32	\$27.43
	1.0 District Secretary	\$34,093		\$43,639.04	\$5.82
59-29-30 / R43-238 Courses of instruction with supplementary instruction in alcohol and drug abuse prevention, traffic laws, fire prevention, physical education/ROTC, emphasis on teaching as a profession	Within funding for minimum program				

DISTRICT Enrollment of: 7,500

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED *	Variable*	COST PER DISTRICT	COST PER PUPIL
Original DMP as defined by base student cost model and documented by: (1) February 20, 1990 memo from the Department of Education to the Special Study Committee on Formula Funding; and (2) 1978 internal Department of Education memo.	1.0 Full-time Fiscal Officer	\$96,342		\$123,317.76	\$16.44
	1.0 Secretary	\$34,093		\$43,639.04	\$5.82
	1.0 Director for Planning	\$96,342		\$123,317.76	\$16.44
	1.0 Assistant Superintendent	\$111,193		\$142,327.04	\$18.98
	1.0 Program Consultant	\$96,342		\$123,317.76	\$16.44
	3.0 Secretary	\$34,093		\$130,917.12	\$17.46
Section 59-59-105 of the EEDA implies that school districts will employ an individual to coordinate career awareness for all students grades K-12	1.0 Coordinator for Career Services	\$71,485		\$91,500.80	\$12.20
Section 59-59-60 of the EEDA requires districts to organize curriculum into clusters	No additional cost; responsibilities of coordinator for career services				
Original DMP as defined by base student cost model and documented in the February 20, 1990 memo from the Department of Education to the Special Study Committee on Formula Funding	Maintenance and operational costs exclude food service which is funded through federal funds and auxiliary revenues. Across districts, the mean per pupil expenditure for safety, building upkeep and maintenance, data processing and business operations is \$1,166 as reported for FY08 on In\$ite.			\$8,745,000.00	\$1,166.00
Original DMP	Office support costs. The original EFA estimate is \$12 per student, increased by inflation over 30 years to \$30.75 in FY10			\$230,625.00	\$30.75
Section 59-20-40 and R43-172 requires districts to account for every pupil according to the EFA classifications in each school	Requires annual financial audit of district and school financial records; average reported by school business officers			\$25,000.00	\$3.33
59-32-30 (R43-238) Comprehensive health education: advisory committee and instruction	Estimated at 2 meetings annually with \$100 per meeting for materials and postage			\$200.00	\$0.03

DISTRICT Enrollment of: 7,500

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED *	Variable*	COST PER DISTRICT	COST PER PUPIL
59-24-80 Each new principal must participate in a formal induction program (R43-167)	About 100 individuals participate in the New Principals Academy each year; estimate at 1.2 new principals per district			\$120.00	\$0.02
Original DMP as defined by base student cost model and documented in the February 20, 1990 memo from the Department of Education to the Special Study Committee on Formula Funding	Instructional Supplies \$25 per student for books purchased for media center/library; \$157 per student for textbooks purchased in addition to state-adopted textbooks, maps, consumables, etc. (FY08 InSite data documents an average expenditure of \$182 for instructional materials and supplies.)			\$1,365,000.00	\$182.00
Computer Hardware: R 43-232 Defined program for grades 6-8 requires keyboarding, computer literacy; R43-233 establishes Career and Technology Education; R43-234 Defined program for grades 9-12 requires computer science including keyboarding as one of the 24 units of credit needed for graduation; and Section 59-59-50 of EEDA requires career clusters that specifically address technology	Based on industry standards, a hard drive and power supply for a computer has a life span of between three and six years. Private sector replaces computers between three and five years. Using a replacement cycle of five years and a computer to student ratio of 1:3.6 which is the current pattern in SC, each year one-fifth or 20% of the computers would be replaced at a cost of \$1,200 per computer which includes the software and wireless capability.		417	\$500,000.00	\$66.67
R43-80 : Student transportation	Transportation costs borne by the state. District salary differential and other travel of \$238 per pupil based on FY08 InSite data			\$1,785,000.00	\$238.00
59-1-450: Each school district must offer a parenting family literacy program (R43-265)	Distribution is based upon minimum of \$40,000 to each district serving more than 2,000 students plus \$4 per pupil for districts exceeding 2,000 students			\$70,000.00	\$9.33

DISTRICT Enrollment of: 7,500

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED *	Variable*	COST PER DISTRICT	COST PER PUPIL
59-28-160 Each district/school must provide an orientation and training for all faculty and staff on parental involvement	Cost estimated at \$500 / day for consultant services for 2-hour training program per school and materials of \$100 per school		12	\$7,200.00	\$0.96
Code citations include references to technology as state goals, the actual teaching of students in technology and use of technology in classroom instruction (Section 59-59-50, 59-31-40, 59-63-1350 and 59-114-10)	In FY08 school districts received \$8,745,000 for connectivity that served approximately 681,845 students or \$12.83 per pupil. Updated numbers for FY09 not available.			\$96,225.00	\$12.83
Sections 59-63-1300 through 59-63-1400	Alternative School: allocation built on 1.74 of base student cost (including regular base student cost). Estimated 1% of student population eligible for program. Using FY10 projected base student cost of \$2,687 the per pupil allocation is projected to be \$4,675		75	\$350,625.00	\$46.75
R43-205.1 ADEPT program	ADEPT, including induction year. District enrollment divided by 1:21 teacher: pupil ratio. Then project one-third of teachers evaluated annually. Each teacher has three evaluators who spend at least one additional work day on the evaluations Using \$48,172 as the salary of the teacher and a 190-day contract, each day costs \$325 per day including fringe benefits. The three days cost \$975 per teacher being evaluated.		119	\$116,071.43	\$15.48
59-18-900 Reporting requirements for annual school and district report card	Fall 2002 Nat'l Conference on State Legislatures estimate: "\$5-10 per pupil" for No Child Left Behind			\$56,250.00	\$7.50

DISTRICT Enrollment of: 7,500

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED *	Variable*	COST PER DISTRICT	COST PER PUPIL
Section 59-53-1950 and Section 59-53-1960 Career and Technology Education Equipment	\$20,000 per district plus \$37.85 per student enrolled in CATE classes for equipment replacement and purchases. Estimate 25% of all students in SC in a CATE class based on enrollment patterns.		1875	\$90,968.75	\$12.13
Total DISTRICT COSTS TO BE ADDED TO SCHOOL COSTS					\$1,929.63

OTHER DISTRICT COSTS:

School Building Aid Program Section 59-21-320 requires annual appropriation of \$30 per student in grades 1 through 12 and \$15 per kindergarten student for capital improvements. Sections 59-21-355, 59-21-420 and 59-21-430 relate to the appropriation of EIA funds for school building purposes. Section 59-21-450 requires all unexpended EIA funds to be reallocated to school building aid program.

Salary* -- Teacher salaries based on 2008-09 General Appropriations Act. All other salaries are based on Table 15 of *Salaries and Wages Paid Professional and Support Personnel in Public Schools, 2008-09* published by Educational Research Service. These salaries are the mean of the average salaries of personnel employed in the Southeast region which includes AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, and WV.

Variable* - Variables refer to data that is dependent upon the enrollment of the district or school and is used in the computation of cost. Variables include number of teachers, number of pupils, number of computers, etc.

HIGH SCHOOL Enrollment of: 900

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED *	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
Regulation 43-205 Maximum daily teaching load per teacher is 150 students with no class exceeding 35 students.	Based on national research, a 21:1 ratio is recommended by this model. Dividing school enrollment by 21 .	\$48,172	43	\$2,642,578.29	\$2,936.20
Regulation 43-205 For special education teachers, the student to teacher ratios range from 10:1 to 15:1 depending upon the student's disability.	Assumption: 13% of the student enrollment will require special education classes of a class size of 12. The result is additional teachers. While the additional weighting for disabled students provides funding for the salaries of these teachers, professional development, teachers supplies and five days of in-service training are additional costs.		4		
Sections 59-18-1930, 59-26-10 and 59-26-30. Regulations 43-55 and 43-165.1 Professional Development for teachers	FY08 In\$ite data documents that districts spent an average of \$343 per pupil for professional development, in-service and staff training. In a random survey of the cost of graduate courses, many public and private colleges and universities provided three-hour credit classes for teachers at a reduced cost. For example, the College of Charleston offers three-hour credit classes for teachers at a total cost of \$425. For the model, \$385 was used which is the average of \$343 and \$425.		47	\$19,990.18	\$22.21
Proviso 1A.31. Teacher Supply Funds allocates \$275 per teacher for supplies.	\$275 x Total Teachers		47	\$12,934.82	\$14.37
59-1-425 stipulates ten days of in-service training of which three days must be used for "collegial professional development," up to two days to prepare for the opening of school and the remaining five days for teacher planning, academic plans, and parent conferences	Using average teacher salary of \$48,172 a teacher is compensated at \$325 per day. Including fringe benefits. Five days per teacher costs \$1,625		47	\$76,375.00	\$84.86

HIGH SCHOOL Enrollment of: 900

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED *	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
Regulation 43-205 a certified principal/director in schools/campuses with more than 250 students	1.0 Principal	\$93,155		\$119,238.40	\$132.49
Regulation 43-205 assistant principal in each school with an enrollment of 500 or more students must be staffed with at least one full-time properly certified assistant principal/assistant director and a properly certified assistant principal or the equivalent for each additional 500 students.	2.0 Assistant Principals	\$71,800		\$183,808.00	\$204.23
Original DMP	1.0 Secretary	\$27,101		\$34,689.28	\$38.54
	1.0 Attendance Clerk/Bookkeeper	\$19,018		\$24,343.04	\$27.05
Regulation 43-205 Two full-time library/media specialist in schools with more than 750 students	2.0 Library/Media Specialists	\$53,081		\$135,887.36	\$150.99
Section 59-59-100 one guidance counselor for every 300 students in high schools; Section 59-59-110 requires implementation of career guidance program	Guidance Counselors	\$54,078	3.0	\$207,659.52	\$230.73
Section 59-66-20 School Safety Coordinator	Original allocation was \$20,500; however, program no longer has separate appropriation; Costs based on midpoint of salary range for a Law Enforcement Officer I which is a pay band of 4 (Source: Office of Human Resources, July 24, 2009)	\$35,457		\$45,384.96	\$50.43
Section 59-59-100 one career specialist in every high school beginning with the 2006-07 school year.	1.0 Career Specialist (Based on salary that is being funded in FY10)	\$40,747		\$52,156.16	\$57.95
Section 59-28-160 and 59-28-170 Parental Involvement: Appoint a faculty contact, provide space, materials and resources	Recommendation from the National Network of Partnership Schools (\$25 per child)			\$22,500.00	\$25.00

HIGH SCHOOL Enrollment of: 900

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED *	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
Section 59-39-100 /Proviso 1A.51 Requires 24 units for high school graduation	Requires additional teachers; funds distributed based upon ADM. Estimate divides current appropriation of \$17,117,711 by 208,702, the 2008-09 135-ADM count for grades 9-12, to yield a per pupil allocation of \$82			\$73,800.00	\$82.00
Section 59-39-310 Requires driver's education course	\$30 per eligible student		225	\$6,750.00	\$7.50
Section 59-18-350 / Provisos 1.27, 1.30., and 1A.47. Allocations for PSAT/PLAN administration	\$10 per exam for all 10th graders		225	\$2,250.00	\$2.50
Section 59-139-10 and Regulation 43-268 Academic assistance applies to students in grades 9-12 and Proviso 1A.62.	Program weights for students needing remediation or identified as gifted and/or talented both artistically and academically are funded separately in the model with EIA revenues. AP and IB classes would be included. In addition, compensatory weights for students in poverty and students who are non-English speaking are funded separately in the model with EIA revenues.				
Section 59-18-500 refer to summer school as part of a student's academic plan; Re Regulation 43-240					
Regulation 43-258.1 and Proviso 1A.61.					
Section 59-29-170, Regulation 43-220 and Proviso 1A.61.					
	According to the fiscal impact statement to H.4662 (Act 282), requiring formative assessments in grades 1 through 9 would cost \$2,203,800. With a 135-day ADM of 493,737 in grades 1 through 9 in FY2007-08, the cost per student would be \$4.50 .		225	\$1,012.50	\$1.13

HIGH SCHOOL Enrollment of: 900

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED *	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
Section 59-59-130 of EEDA requires by school year 2009-10 the implementation of High Schools that Work in every high school	According to the fiscal impact statement to H.3155 of 2005-06 legislative session, High Schools that Work cost \$10,000 per school. SCDE reports that high and middle schools with established programs will receive \$2,200 in FY10 and new programs \$8,600 per school in FY10 due to budget reductions.			\$10,000.00	\$11.11
Total for High School					\$4,079.29

Salary* -- Teacher salaries based on 2008-09 General Appropriations Act. All other salaries are based on Table 15 of *Salaries and Wages Paid Professional and Support Personnel in Public Schools, 2008-09* published by Educational Research Service. These salaries are the mean of the average salaries of personnel employed in the Southeast region which includes AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, and WV.

Variable* - Variables refer to data that is dependent upon the enrollment of the district or school and is used in the computation of cost. Variables include number of teachers, number of pupils, number of computers, etc.

MIDDLE SCHOOL Enrollment of: 750

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
Regulation 43-205 Prevents any class from having more than 35 students except for students with disabilities Student-Teacher Ratio: Grade 6 ELA and Math, 30:1 and all other subjects, 35:1 Grades 7-8, 35:1	Based on national research, a 21:1 ratio is recommended by this model. Divide school enrollment by 21 to yield number of teachers needed. Round to the nearest .5 teachers.	\$48,172	36	\$2,202,148.57	\$2,936.20
Regulation 43-205 For special education teachers, the student to teacher ratios range from 10:1 to 15:1 depending upon the student's disability.	Assumption: 13% of the student enrollment will require special education classes of a class size of 12. The result is additional teachers. While the additional weighting for disabled students provides funding for the salaries of these teachers, professional development, teachers supplies and five days of in-service training are additional costs.		3.5		
Sections 59-18-1930, 59-26-10 and 59-26-30. Regulations 43-55 and 43-165.1 Professional Development for teachers	FY08 In\$ite data documents that districts spent an average of \$343 per pupil for professional development, in-service and staff training. In a random survey of the cost of graduate courses, many public and private colleges and universities provided three-hour credit classes for teachers at a reduced cost. For example, the College of Charleston offers three-hour credit classes for teachers at a total cost of \$425. For the model, \$425 was used.		39.5	\$16,787.50	\$22.38
Proviso 1A.31. Teacher Supply Funds allocates \$275 per teacher for supplies.	\$275 x Total Teachers		39.5	\$10,862.50	\$14.48

MIDDLE SCHOOL Enrollment of: 750

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
59-1-425 stipulates ten days of inservice training of which three days must be used for "collegial professional development," up to two days to prepare for the opening of school and the remaining five days for teacher planning, academic plans, and parent conferences	Using average teacher salary of \$48,172 a teacher is compensated at \$325 per day. Including fringe benefits. Five days per teacher costs \$1,625		39.5	\$64,187.50	\$85.58
Regulation 43-205 one principal with an enrollment of 250 students or more	1.0 Principal	\$86,794		\$111,096.32	\$148.13
Regulation 43-205 an assistant principal or curriculum coordinator in schools over 500 students	1.0 Assistant Principal	\$68,469		\$87,640.32	\$116.85
Original DMP	1.0 Secretary	\$27,101		\$34,689.28	\$46.25
	1.0 Attendance Clerk/Bookkeeper	\$19,018		\$24,343.04	\$32.46
Section 59-59-100 requires one guidance counselor for every 300 students in middle school	Guidance Counselors	\$54,078	2.5	\$173,049.60	\$230.73
Regulation 43-205 Schools having an enrollment of 750 or more must employ 2 full-time media specialists	2.0 Media Specialists	\$53,081		\$135,887.36	\$181.18
Section 59-66-20 School Resource Officers	Original allocation was \$20,500; however, program no longer has separate appropriation; Costs based on midpoint of salary range for a Law Enforcement Officer I which is a pay band of 4 (Source: Office of Human Resources, July 24, 2009)	\$35,457		\$45,384.96	\$60.51
Section 59-59-100 one career specialist in every middle school beginning with the 2006-07 school year.	1.0 Career Specialist (Based on salary that is being funded in FY10)	\$40,747		\$52,156.16	\$69.54
Section 59-28-160 and 59-28-170 Parental Involvement: Appoint a faculty contact, provide space, materials and resources	Recommendation from the National Network of Partnership Schools (\$25 per child)			\$18,750.00	\$25.00

MIDDLE SCHOOL Enrollment of: 750

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
Section 5-7-12 and Provisos 1A.49.Middle School Initiative	Provides funds to be used for school resource officer, counselor or nurse in middle schools containing 7th grade. Total appropriation of \$3,576,330 is divided by 158,266, the 135th day ADM for grades 6 through 8 in 2008-09, to yield \$22.60 per pupil.			\$16,950.00	\$22.60
Section 59-18-310 statewide formative assessment program for students	According to the fiscal impact statement to H.4662 (Act 282), requiring formative assessments in grades 1 through 9 would cost \$2,203,800. With a 135-day ADM of 493,737 in grades 1 through 9 in FY2007-08, the cost per student would be \$4.50.			\$3,375.00	\$4.50
Proviso 2.7. 6-8 Lottery Enhancement Funds, Grades 6-8 Reading, Math, Science and Social Studies Program	Currently, lottery funds for 6-8 enhancement are allocated based on the sum of \$5 times the number of non-free and reduced price lunch/Medicaid eligible students and \$15 times the number of free/reduced price lunch/Medicaid eligible students. This model would allocate the \$2.0 million currently allocated for middle schools across 158,266 students in grades 6 - 8 per 2008-09 135-day ADM, resulting in a \$12.64 per pupil.			\$9,480.00	\$12.64
Section 59-18-500 refer to summer school as part of a student's academic plan; Re Regulation 43-240;	Program weights for students needing remediation or identified as gifted and/or talented both artistically and academically are funded separately in the model with EIA revenues. AP and IB classes would be included. In addition, compensatory weights for students in poverty and students who are non-English speaking are funded separately in the model with EIA revenues.				
Section 59-139-10 and Regulation 43-268 Academic assistance applies to students in grades 6-8; and Proviso 1A.62.					
Section 59-29-170, Regulation 43-220 and Proviso 1A.61.					
Total for Middle School					\$4,009.05

Salary* -- Teacher salaries based on 2008-09 General Appropriations Act. All other salaries are based on Table 15 of Salaries and Wages Paid Professional and Support Personnel in Public Schools, 2008-09 published by Educational Research Service. These salaries are the mean of the average salaries of personnel employed in the Southeast region which includes AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, and WV.

Variable* - Variables refer to data that is dependent upon the enrollment of the district or school and is used in the computation of cost. Variables include number of teachers, number of pupils, number of computers, etc.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL Enrollment of: 500

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
Regulation 43-205: Average student-teacher ratio not to exceed 28:1 with a district maintaining an average student-teacher ratio of 21:1 in reading and math in grades one through three. Maximum Student to Teacher Ratios by grade: Prekindergarten, 20:1 Grades K-3, 30:1 Grades 4-5 ELA and Math, 30:1 Grades 4-5 All other subjects, 35:1 Section 59-35-10 Requires full-day kindergarten unless parents exempt child	Based on national research, a 21:1 ratio is recommended by this model. Divide school enrollment by 21 to yield number of teachers needed. Round to the nearest .5 teachers.	\$48,172	24	\$1,479,843.84	\$2,959.69
Regulation 43-205 For special education teachers, the student to teacher ratios range from 10:1 to 15:1 depending upon the student's disability.	Assumption: 13% of the student enrollment will require special education classes of a class size of 12. The result is additional teachers. While the additional weighting for disabled students provides funding for the salaries of these teachers, professional development, teachers supplies and five days of in-service training are additional costs.		2		
Sections 59-18-1930, 59-26-10 and 59-26-30. Regulations 43-55 and 43-165.1 Professional Development for teachers	FY08 In\$ite data documents that districts spent an average of \$343 per pupil for professional development, in-service and staff training. In a random survey of the cost of graduate courses, many public and private colleges and universities provided three-hour credit classes for teachers at a reduced cost. For example, the College of Charleston offers three-hour credit classes for teachers at a total cost of \$425. For the model, \$425 was used.		26	\$11,050.00	\$22.10

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL Enrollment of: 500

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
Proviso 1A.31. Teacher Supply Funds allocates \$275 per teacher for supplies.	\$275 x Total Teachers		26	\$7,150.00	\$14.30
59-1-425 stipulates ten days of in-service training of which three days must be used for "collegial professional development," up to two days to prepare for the opening of school and the remaining five days for teacher planning, academic plans, and parent conferences	Using average teacher salary of \$48,172 a teacher is compensated at \$325 per day. Including fringe benefits. Five days per teacher costs \$1,625		26	\$42,250.00	\$84.50
Regulation 43-205 One principal for school with at least 375 students	1.0 Principal	\$82,175		\$105,184.00	\$210.37
Regulation 43-205 requires each school with an enrollment of 600 or more students to be staffed with at least one full-time assistant principal	Enrollment is less than 600; therefore, none is required.				
Original DMP	1.0 Secretary	\$27,101		\$34,689.28	\$69.38
	1.0 Attendance clerk/bookkeeper	\$19,018		\$24,343.04	\$48.69
Regulation 43-205 requires schools with an enrollment of 400 or more to employ a full-time media specialist	1.0 Library Media Specialist	\$53,081		\$67,943.68	\$135.89
Regulation 43-205 requires schools with an enrollment of 501 or more to employ one full-time certified counselor.	1.0 Guidance Counselor	\$54,078		\$69,219.84	\$138.44
Section 59-10-210 Beginning school year 2007-08, one nurse in every elementary school	1.0 Nurse	\$36,720		\$47,001.60	\$94.00

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL Enrollment of: 500

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
Sections 59-10-10 and 59-10-20 of the Students Health and Fitness Act of 2005 and Provisos 1.64. and 1.71. require each student to have 50 minutes a week in PE in a class not to exceed 28 students per teacher; 59-10-20 requires one PE teacher for every 700 elementary students in FY07, one to 600 in FY08 and one to 500 in FY09. Section 59-210-40 requires professional development for PE teachers	1.0 PE Teacher	\$48,172		\$61,660.16	\$123.32
Section 59-28-160 and 59-28-170 Parental Involvement: Appoint a faculty contact, provide space, materials and resources	Recommendation from the National Network of Partnership Schools			\$12,500.00	\$25.00
Section 59-1-525; Proviso 2.7 Education Lottery Appropriations: K-5 Enhancement Program	Funds are currently allocated in Fiscal Year 2009-10: \$60,000 minimum per district plus \$75 per K-5 students and a pro-rata share of funding based on students in poverty for a total of \$44,733,800. \$20,000 for coaches in math/science, technology and literacy for a total of \$1,630,000. The 2008-09 135-day ADM for grades K-5 was 324,403. Consequently, using the 135-day ADM for grades K-5 of 324,403, each student would receive an allocation of \$143.			\$71,500.00	\$143.00
Section 59-18-310 formative assessment for students	According to the fiscal impact statement to H.4662 (Act 282), requiring formative assessments in grades 1 through 9 would cost \$2,203,800. With a 135-day ADM of 493,737 in grades 1 through 9 in FY2007-08, the cost per student would be \$4.50 .			\$2,250.00	\$4.50
59-139-10 & Regulation 43-267 Early Childhood Intervention (Act 135) applies to grades 1-3	Compensatory weights for students in poverty and for students who are non-English speaking are funded separately in the model with EIA revenues.				

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL Enrollment of: 500

REQUIREMENT	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
59-139-10 & Regulation 43-268 Academic assistance applies to students in grades 4-5 and Proviso 1A.62.	Performance weights for students needing remediation and students identified and served as gifted and/or talented both artistically are funded separately in the model with EIA revenues. In addition, compensatory weights for students in poverty and students who are non-English speaking are funded separately in the model with EIA revenues.				
59-18-500 (B-D), Regulation 43-240 Summer Schools					
Section 59-29-170, Regulation 43-220 & Proviso 1A.61. Gifted and talented program incorporates ratio of 1:20 for special school model and 1:15 for resource model					
Total for Elementary School					\$4,073.17
OTHER PRE-K Programs:	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
Chapter 139 of Title 59, Regulation 43-264 and Proviso 1A.12. Half-day program for four-year olds. Allocations based on the number of kindergarten children who are eligible for free and reduced lunch; however, no district receives less than 90 percent of the amount it received in the prior fiscal year.	In FY2007-08, \$21,532,678 in EIA funds were allocated to an estimated 17,614 children in half-day four-year-old programs or \$1,222 per child.				\$1,222.48
Proviso 1.62. SC Child Development Education Pilot Program	In the fourth year of the pilot program, the instructional reimbursement rate is \$4,093 per child.				\$4,093.00

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL Enrollment of: 500

OTHER PRE-K Programs:	EXPLANATION OF CALCULATION	SALARY USED	Variable*	COST PER SCHOOL	COST PER PUPIL
Section 59-36-50 and Proviso 1.9 services for preschoolers with disabilities	1995 Joint Committee to Study Formula Funding in Education Programs recommended \$3,009 per student. In Fiscal Year 2008-09, 14,474 preschoolers with disabilities were served at \$3,742,202. The population served is 4.5% of the total state enrollment in elementary schools.			\$67,702.50	\$135.41

Salary* -- Teacher salaries based on 2008-09 General Appropriations Act. All other salaries are based on Table 15 of Salaries and Wages Paid Professional and Support Personnel in Public Schools, 2008-09 published by Educational Research Service. These salaries are the mean of the average salaries of personnel employed in the Southeast region which includes AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN, VA, and WV.

Variable* - Variables refer to data that is dependent upon the enrollment of the district or school and is used in the computation of cost. Variables include number of teachers, number of pupils, number of computers, etc.

WPU COUNTS

Classifications	2006-07 ADM	2007-08 ADM	2008-09 ADM	Current Weights	Revised Weights	2009 Revised WPU's
Kindergarten	46,422.29	45,933.11	46,218.44	1.30	1.00	46,218.44
Primary (1-3)	135,459.10	140,128.19	141,214.98	1.24	1.00	141,214.98
Elementary (4-8)				1.00		
Elementary (4-5)	86,607.79	88,984.29	91,676.05		1.00	91,676.05
Middle (6-8)	138,730.68	137,449.40	137,076.12		1.00	137,076.12
High School (9-12)	77,104.74	75,744.02	77,032.81	1.25	1.00	77,032.81
Educable Mentally Handicapped	6,084.15	5,141.99	4,525.01	1.74		7,873.52
Learning Disabled	45,703.88	45,210.16	45,147.06	1.74		78,555.88
Trainable Mentally Handicapped	2,527.39	2,551.93	2,489.40	2.04		5,078.38
Emotionally Handicapped	4,391.67	3,886.19	3,622.95	2.04		7,390.82
Orthopedically Handicapped	976.05	957.55	947.13	2.04		1,932.15
Visually Handicapped	588.10	612.32	622.4	2.57		1,599.57
Hearing Handicapped	1,170.44	1,139.85	1,140.83	2.57		2,931.93
Speech Handicapped	32,481.93	31,148.55	30,336.53	1.90		57,639.41
Homebound	2,449.23	2,360.19	2,278.05	2.10	1.00	2,278.05
Autism	2,251.67	2,514.77	2,828.60	2.57		7,269.50
Vocational 1	63,700.01	64,128.39	65,809.02	1.29		

Classifications	2006-07 ADM	2007-08 ADM	2008-09 ADM	Current Weights	Revised Weights	2009 Revised WPU's
Vocational 2	23,032.79	24,506.42	24,790.50	1.29		
Vocational 3	12,163.76	13,274.13	13,683.01	1.29		
Career and Technology (Combine Vocational 1, 2 and 3l)	98,896.56	101,908.94	104,282.53		1.20	125,139.04
Total General Education WPU's						790,907
<u>Additional Classifications:</u>						
<i>Compensatory:</i>						
Poverty (K-12)	433,517.46	440,886.73	449,806.00		0.20	88,177.35
Non-English Speaking	24,685.00	28,000.00	31,275.00		0.20	5,600.00
Total Compensatory WPU's						93,777
<i>Program:</i>						
Gifted and Talented (3-12)	102,387.00	102,164.00	114,077.00	0.30	0.15	15,324.60
Remediation	109,673.00	105,936.00	103,193.00	0.114	0.15	15,890.40
Adult Education 17-21 Population	19,407.00	18,761.00	19,876.00		0.20	3,752.20
Total Performance WPU's						34,967
GRAND TOTAL WPU's						919,651

- All counts are based upon the 2008-09 actual ADM counts, http://ed.sc.gov/agency/Finance-and-Operations/Finance/old/finance/student_data/documents/DMEM09.txt. All classifications and ADMs in bold are unduplicated counts.

EXPLANATION OF CLASSIFICATIONS

Adult Education: The funds would target young people who are between the ages of 17 and 21 and have not obtained a high school diploma. The allocation would equal \$1,000 per student for a minimum of 300 hours of attendance or the successful completion of a high school credential during the school year. In 2008-09 2,544 high school diplomas and GED diplomas were awarded to individuals participating in young adult education. There were 15,519 young adults pre-tested and 8,713 pre and post-tested. Assuming 50% of the students were pre and post-tested, the total served would be 19,876.

Remediation: In 2008, approximately 103,193 students in grades three through eight scored Below Basic on ELA, or mathematics or both. The weighting of 0.15 would provide additional monies for remediation services for these students.

Poverty: The original EOC funding models had separate line items for prevention and remediation. Prevention was targeted to students in grades K-3 who were eligible for the free and reduced price lunch program and/or Medicaid. Remediation targeted students in grades 3-8 who had scored Below Basic on one or more sections of PACT. The 2006 EOC funding model allocated funds for all students in grades K-12 who are eligible for the free and reduced price lunch and/or Medicaid. The poverty weighting recognizes the chronic

impact of poverty and assists students who score Below Basic to improve and students who score Basic or above to maintain academic achievement. According to the 2008 district report cards, 65.06% of all students in grades K through 12 were eligible for the free and reduced price lunch program and/or Medicaid. Using the 135-day ADM of 691,371, 65.06% of the 135-day ADM or 449,806 are students in poverty.

Limited English Proficiency (LEP) or English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL):

A January 2009 report to the Joint Standing Committee on Education and Cultural Affairs in Maine reviewed LEP Funding policies in the United States. Forty-four states fund LEP services through pupil weightings, flat grants or resource-based allocations. An August 2007 report by the Federation for American Immigration Reform documents that state expenditures for English language instruction programs in public schools range from \$290 per student in Idaho to \$711 per student in Tennessee. In Tennessee, the local share of the funding program is documented at an additional \$487 per enrollee. The total amount of state and local expenditures in Tennessee is approximately \$1,200 per student. Using the Tennessee model of \$1,200 per student, the revised LEP weight for SC would be 0.20. The state of North Carolina which funds LEP with state appropriations has created a Joint Select Committee on Public School Funding Formulas.

Gifted and Talented (G&T): In FY 2008-09 there were 71,977 Gifted and Talented Academic Students served and 16,095 Gifted and Talented Artistic Students served. Total EIA payments to school districts for the G&T program totaled \$31,248,638 or \$335 per student. Another 26,005 students took one or more Advanced Placement exams in school year 2008-09.

The Education Oversight Committee does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, or handicap in its practices relating to employment or establishment and administration of its programs and initiatives. Inquiries regarding employment, programs and initiatives of the Committee should be directed to the Executive Director 803.734.6148.